# CIO WORKING SESSION REPORT

# JANUARY 20, 2005

Thank you for participating in the Statewide Internet Portal Authority CIO working session Thursday afternoon. We were pleased to have representation from state agencies, municipalities, higher education, counties and the private sector. The input you provided is very valuable, and we look very forward to building a strong, collaborative relationship with you in order to make the Statewide Internet Portal a success. Although we covered many topics, this report concentrates on key points from the discussion, findings from the brainstorm activities and commonalities among group presentations. If you would like more detailed notes, please contact Angie Onorofskie at the SIPA office 303-542-1803.

### Key Notes from Discussion with Gregg Rippy, Interim CEO

Gregg Rippy gave a brief background on how SIPA was formed, and he explained that the Portal Authority is an independent public body - politic with a corporate structure. He explained that his role as the interim CEO is to lead the organization in the near-term and essentially find a permanent Executive Director for the Portal Authority.

He also explained the diverse representation of the Board of Directors – there is representation from state departments, representation from private sector and local governments. The following discussions took place:
- Clarification of the relationship between SIPA, OIT, IMC, JBC and others.
- How efforts can be coordinated among these entities and who is actually in charge.

In regards to the business model, the following discussions took place:
- Funding was a questionable matter; and further clarification of the business model may be needed.
- What target audience is SIPA trying to reach?
    - The group determined that the citizen is the target audience, but further clarification of the definition of a citizen is needed.
- There was concern that SIPA will not be successful without business plans from the various departments and agencies.
- The question was raised as to whether or not an executive order was necessary to get the various departments and agencies on board.
    - Gregg stated that he did not believe that this would happen.

The discussion was very helpful in determining some areas of confusion where further clarification is necessary. Communication is very important to the CIO community and SIPA, and that is an area we would really like to emphasize. Gregg Rippy will take calls from anyone on his cell phone, night or day. Gregg's phone number is 970 379-6100, and his email address is: grippy@mindspring.com.

**Benefits**

The Statewide Internet Portal Authority has the opportunity to provide many benefits to its customers. Benefits were separated into four categories: Financial, Security, Services to Organizations and Other. The benefits you provided that were similar or related were grouped together. In the following table, the two most valuable benefits from each category are listed.

|  | *Benefits* | |
|---|---|---|
| *Financial* | Payment engine and benefits associated (19) | Cost savings as a result of aggregation/ buying power etc. (3) |
| *Security* | ID management/ single login/ authentication (13) | Consistent security – only as strong as weakest link (8) |
| *Services to Organizations* | Shared resources/ best business practice (19) | One – stop – shop/ single point of entry (4) |
| *Other* | Ease of finding information and services/ standardized (11) | 24 hour customer service (5) |

The grouping activity proved to be very effective in recognizing that the group identified common benefits that the portal has the opportunity to provide.

**Functional Needs and Wants (1ˢᵗ - Pass)**

During the brainstorming activity, we asked you to think of functional needs and wants, and each person voted for the most valuable need or want in each of the categories: Payment Engine; Development of the Portal; Hosting, Security, Disaster Recovery, Email; Interactive Applications; and Other.  The functional needs and wants you provided that were similar or related were grouped together.  The results are in the table below:

| | *Functional Needs and Wants (1ˢᵗ Pass)* | |
|---|---|---|
| **Payment Engine** | Central payment engine that can be used regardless of where it is hosted (10) | Enough information to accommodate necessary accounting for backend processing/ easily reconciled/ all payment forms (4) |
| **Development of the Portal** | Make use of resources from state, local, county government agencies/ don't reinvent the wheel/ seamless integration (12) | Access to information regardless of where it is located/ naming standards (7) |
| **Hosting, Security, Disaster Recovery, E-Mail** | ID management for all applications/ citizen login/ authentication (9) | Multiple disaster recovery sites (1) <br> Web page hosting (1) |
| **Interactive Applications** | Car/ driver's license online renewal (4) | Common sales tax collection/ self collecting municipals/ website forms for payment etc. (3) |
| **Other** | Local/ state service availability by input address (4) | Ability to provide services no matter who provides them (3) |
| | | |

This summary activity was effective in recognizing the most valuable functional needs and wants, and there was consistency throughout the group.  The next two sections touch on the areas covered during the group presentations.

## Common Considerations for Prioritizing Functionality

We asked you to form groups and develop an opinion of what the top five considerations should be in terms of prioritizing functionality for the Statewide Internet Portal Authority. After the group presentations, it was evident that there were certainly some common considerations between groups when prioritizing functionality. Again, grouping was used where similarities occurred. The common considerations are as follows:

1. Early wins/ easy to do
2. Large citizen appeal/ high adoption rate/ multi-jurisdictional/transferable functionality
3. Risk considerations/ ease of implementation/ do not reinvent the wheel
4. Money and cost savings/ business case
5. Buzz factor/ improved citizen convenience/ interactive functionality

## Common Suggested Processes for Collaboration

Given that SIPA would like to develop the portal in collaboration with cities, counties, state departments and agencies, we asked that you suggest a process for collaboration. Again, common processes were suggested. These common processes are:

1. The portal is a means to collaborate including: surveys, communications to constituent organizations such as CGAIT, CIMA, CIO forums, etc., list serves, and intranet websites
2. Liaison concept/ SWAT team
3. Jurisdictional centers of excellence
4. Establish and educate on metrics and scorings for ratings of new services: forming subcommittees to review, recommend and submit ideas
5. Consistent and ongoing messages, specific and measurable including: responses to feedback
6. Prioritization process should include citizen input and ability to change priorities

The overall communication process theme derived from this exercise is that the CIO group as a whole would like to be communicated with in a professional, timely manner. This includes response to feedback in a timely manner. The communication process should be inclusive of all CIO communities within the state, and the range of users should be recognized. The group also felt that the technology could be used to help develop the portal including: interactive BLOGS, list serves and other communication mechanisms. The prioritization would be transparent and include the ability to reprioritize as the environment changes. The group also felt that there was an opportunity to leverage the use of best practices within the existing community as a part of the existing community.

## Conclusion

Overall, we believe that this workshop was very positive.  It is our hope that during the workshop clarifications were provided, and it was made known that we desire continuous communications with you.  We found that there is consistency with benefits, needs and wants, prioritization, and process of collaboration.  Again, your input is very valuable.  We plan to use the information gathered to move along in the right direction.  Please give us feedback on the workshop and let us know whether or not it was a good use of your time. Also, if you are interested in briefing other CIOs who were unable to attend the workshop, we can give you adequate materials.  Finally, we'd like to ask for your input on the topics that you would like to see covered in the future.  Please contact us anytime with any questions, concerns or suggestions.

Thank you to everyone who attended and for your excellent input.  If your name is not on this list and should be, please contact Angie Onorofskie at 303-542-1803 or portalauthority@state.co.us.

## Participants

| | |
|---|---|
| Alan Wyman | Mark Pray |
| Bill Miller | Michele Hovet |
| Brian Balay | Mike Locatis |
| Brian Morrow | Mike McGirk |
| Claire Jozwiak | Mike Whatley |
| Dave Gallaher | Rick Malinowski |
| Dianne Kress | Ron Ozga |
| Don Fleer | Steve O'Brien |
| Gary Gordier | Steve Sopata |
| Greg Jenik | Steve Swanson |
| Jeff Sherrard | Steve Uretsky |
| Jerry Nolan | Theresa Brandorff |
| Jim Lynn | Tim Fritz |
| Julie Carnahan | Tina Camblin |
| Ken Price | Tom Charkut |
| Kevin Capp | |